



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/690,366	10/16/2000	Billy P. Taylor	1005.6	3106
53953	7590	04/16/2009	EXAMINER	
DAVIS LAW GROUP, P.C. 6836 BEE CAVES ROAD SUITE 220 AUSTIN, TX 78746			LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			2178	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/16/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/690,366	Applicant(s) TAYLOR, BILLY P.
	Examiner MATTHEW J. LUDWIG	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4-6,9-11,14,15,18-20,23-25 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 9-11, 14-15, 18-20, 23-25, 28-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/8B/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination received 2/3/2009.
2. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 14-15, 18-20, 23-25, 28-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 11, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29, and 30 are independent claims.
3. The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ono et al., have been withdrawn pursuant to applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 14, 15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rosenoff et al., USPN 7,003,719 filed 1/25/1999.**

In reference to independent claim 1, Rosenoff teaches:

*'storing a version of a paper, the version being displayed on a display device as a likeness of a paper
at a first location within the version, detecting a reference to a second location,
wherein the second location is external to the paper, and wherein the detected reference is at*

least one of the following, other than a network address: an alphanumeric character, a symbol; a term; and a phrase;

in response to the detected reference, embedding a hyperlink within the detected reference at a first location, wherein the hyperlink is selectable at the first location by a user to cause an operation associated with the second location; and

while the first location is displayed on the display device, highlighting the first location to indicate the hyperlink as being selectable at the first location by the user to cause the operation associated with the second location'.

A means of manipulating documents through a processor such as letters, resumes, research papers, and legal briefs. The software automatically locates and marks specific portions of a document and defines hyperlinks including at least a portion of the marked text. See column 1, lines 13-29 and column 2, lines 40-67.

The reference further teaches a means of detection at a first location terms that refer to a second location that is external to the document. The detected reference is found through the use of a tokenizer which encapsulates information within the found object. See figure 2 and column 6, lines 29-67.

The link builder object as described in the reference to Rosenoff discloses a means of defining and inserting hyperlinks into the detected reference at the first location. See column 9, lines 34-67 and column 14, lines 35-67. A selection of the hyperlink would cause an operation related to the second location.

The exemplary document illustrated in figure 1 includes portions which have been marked, for example, visibly in contrasting color or font, to signify its association with an existing hyperlink. See column 4, lines 50-67.

In reference to dependent claim 4 and 5, Rosenoff teaches:

The reference further teaches a means of detection at a first location terms that refer to a second location that is external to the document. The detected reference is found through the use of a tokenizer which encapsulates information within the found object. See figure 2 and column 6, lines 29-67.

The link builder object as described in the reference to Rosenoff discloses a means of defining and inserting hyperlinks into the detected reference at the first location. See column 9, lines 34-67 and column 14, lines 35-67. A selection of the hyperlink would cause an operation related to the second location. The URL that is inserted into the text is utilized by the user to retrieve information from a second location (server/website). See column 15, lines 10-56.

In reference to claims 6, 9, and 10, the claims recite the system for carrying out the hyperlink embedding steps found in claims 1, 4, and 5, respectively. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to claims 11, 14, and 15, the claims recite the system for carrying out the hyperlink embedding steps found in claims 1, 4, and 5, respectively. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to dependent claim 18, Rosenoff teaches:

Document management programs, presentation development programs, browsing programs, which include image software programs as listed in the reference. The reference suggests the retrieval of images. See column 4, lines 26-56 and column 16, lines 25-45.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 19, 20, 23-25, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenoff et al., USPN 7,003,719 filed (1/25/1999).**

In reference to independent claim 19 and 20, the claim recites similar limitations to those found in independent claim 1. A means of manipulating documents through a processor such as letters, resumes, research papers, and legal briefs. The software automatically locates and marks specific portions of a document and defines hyperlinks including at least a portion of the marked text. See column 1, lines 13-29 and column 2, lines 40-67.

The reference further teaches a means of detection at a first location terms that refer to a second location that is external to the document. The detected reference is found through the use of a tokenizer which encapsulates information within the found object. See figure 2 and column 6, lines 29-67.

The link builder object as described in the reference to Rosenoff discloses a means of defining and inserting hyperlinks into the detected reference at the first location. See column 9, lines 34-67 and column 14, lines 35-67. A selection of the hyperlink would cause an operation related to the second location.

However, the second location, as described within independent claim 19 is a file external to the paper. The file includes audio information and the language found within independent claim 20 includes a script. The reference to Rosenoff discloses HTML programs and other software programs that allow for the embedded hyperlinks to be directed to multimedia formatting languages. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the multimedia software disclosed in the reference and provide a user with a means for linking to both textual information as well as multimedia information to provide a user with a broad spectrum of information gathering.

In reference to dependent claim 23, Rosenoff teaches:

The reference further teaches a means of detection at a first location terms that refer to a second location that is external to the document. The detected reference is found through the use of a tokenizer which encapsulates information within the found object. See figure 2 and column 6, lines 29-67.

The link builder object as described in the reference to Rosenoff discloses a means of defining and inserting hyperlinks into the detected reference at the first location. See column 9, lines 34-67 and column 14, lines 35-67. A selection of the hyperlink would cause an operation related to the second location. The URL that is inserted into the text is utilized by the user to retrieve information from a second location (server/website). See column 15, lines 10-56.

In reference to claims 24, 25, 28, 29, and 30, the claims recite similar limitations to those found in rejected claims 19, 20, and 23. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1, 4-6, 9-11, 14-15, 18-20, 23-25, 28-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant amended the claims and introduced new language into the independent claims thus changing the scope of the invention when the claims are read as a whole. The rejections of the claims have been modified to adjust for the newly added language.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW J. LUDWIG whose telephone number is (571)272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2178

ML